

Appl. No. 10/657,001  
Amdt. Dated 5/14/2004  
Reply to Office Action of 3/09/2004

**Remarks/Arguments**

Applicant would like to thank the examiner for the thorough review of the present invention.

Applicant respectfully submits the currently amended independent claims are patentable under 35 USC §§ 102, 103 because no prior art of record, either individually or combined, anticipates or renders obvious such claim recitations. All original dependent claims include the recitations of their associated independent claims and therefore are allowable for the same reasons advanced hereinbelow.

Applicant's currently amended independent claims recite, *inter alia*, *a door jamb including a central portion and a plurality of oppositely spaced lip portions integral therewith, one said plurality of lip portions being disposed adjacent an interior of a dwelling and extending orthogonally from said central portion for covering a portion of said reinforcement plate to thereby protect same from unauthorized access, another said plurality of lip portions extending orthogonal to said central portion and away from the wall stud, said another lip portion providing a surface for engaging a door when moved to a closed position.*

The Davis reference does not disclose such a door jamb. Rather it discloses a door having substantially planar inner and outer surfaces wherein the reinforcing plate 46 is positioned against the inner surface and the striking plate 12 is positioned against the outer surface. The Elliot reference discloses a reinforcing member 120 that is structurally unobvious from applicant's claimed reinforcing plate (see FIG. 8 of Elliot). In particular, the Elliot reinforcing plate has a pair of extensions 124 that teach away from applicant's claimed reinforcing plate.

Camperelli discloses door jambs 3, 4, but such members do not have oppositely spaced lip portions in the manner claimed in Applicant's currently amended independent claims. O'Hanlon discloses a door jamb 20 having a conventional configuration. Also, O'Hanlon employs side plates 2, 3 for defining "U" arms that can bend inwardly during an external impact so that the strike 6 maintains its structural integrity. Accordingly, O'Hanlon teaches away from the claimed invention and does not provide any suggestion, teaching or motivation to incorporate the reinforcing plate of Elliot because

Appl. No. 10/657,001  
Amdt. Dated 5/14/2004  
Reply to Office Action of 3/09/2004

such a reinforcing plate is not necessary in view of the O'Hanlon's bendable "U" arms (see FIGS. 1-4 of O'Hanlon; column 4, lines 32-46).

Should the examiner consider necessary or desirable to make formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawings, then it is respectfully asked that such changes be made by examiner's Amendment, if the examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. Alternatively, should the examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,  
Law Office of Ashkan Najafi, P.A.

By \_\_\_\_\_

  
Ashkan Najafi, Esq.  
Reg. No. 49,078  
Customer No. 34,356

113 Lamplighter Lane  
Ponte Vedra Beach, FL 32082  
Telephone: 904-551-6110  
Facsimile: 904-551-6111  
[patentattorney@patent-usa.com](mailto:patentattorney@patent-usa.com)